

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Final Office Action mailed on December 3, 2004. Applicants respectfully request consideration of the application as amended herein. Claims 1-21 were rejected. Please amend claims 1, 11 and 15. Please cancel claim 2. No new claims have been added. Applicants requested cancellation without prejudice of claim 5 in a previous amendment. Therefore, claims 1, 3-4 and 6-21 are pending.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 6-8, 10-11, 14-15 and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Sarkar* (U.S. Patent No. 6,012,067). Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are patentable over *Sarkar*. The cited reference does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of the Applicants' claims.

Specifically, independent claim 1 includes the limitation: "a set of questions to be presented to a user as part of a customer relationship management user interface." Independent claims 11 and 15 each have a similar limitation. Applicants submit that *Sarkar* does not contain this limitation.

Rather, *Sarkar* discloses a mechanism for representing and manipulating heterogeneous objects in relational databases over the internet. (*Sarkar*, col. 5, lines 12-14). In *Sarkar*, SQL queries uniformly manipulate disparate relational data and other complex web objects. (*Sarkar*, col. 5, lines 58-60). Examiner implies that these SQL queries are the set of questions of claim 1. (Office Action, Dec.3, 2004, p. 2, 6). However, the queries of *Sarkar* are presented to a database

to manipulate that database. (*Sarkar*, col. 5, lines 63-65). Specifically, in *Sarkar*, the SQL queries uniformly manipulate local and/or remote database table, attributes and objects. (*Sarkar*, col. 5, lines 63-65). Thus, *Sarkar* queries databases not users. In contrast, in claim 1, the set of questions are presented to a user as part of a customer relationship management (CRM) user interface. Thus, *Sarkar* fails to teach or suggest all of Applicants' claimed limitations.

Accordingly, *Sarkar* does not anticipate independent claims 1, 11, and 15. Claims 3-4, 6-10, 12-14 and 16-21 depend, directly or indirectly, from one of the foregoing independent claims. Therefore, *Sarkar* fails to anticipate claims 2-4, 6-10, 12-14 and 16-21 for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 11, and 15. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 3-5, 9, 12-13 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sarkar* in view of *Kingberg*, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,734,887). Claim 5 has been canceled. Applicants respectfully submit that the remaining claims are patentable over *Sarkar* and *Kingberg*. The cited references do not disclose, suggest or render obvious, either individually or in combination, all of the elements of the Applicants' claims.

As discussed above, *Sarkar* does not teach or suggest the limitation of independent claims 1, 11 and 15, from which claims 3-4, 9, 12-13 and 16-17 depend, directed towards a set of questions to be presented to a user as part of a customer relationship management user interface. Applicants respectfully submit that *Kingberg* also does not teach or suggest the claimed limitation missing in *Sarkar*. *Kingberg* is directed, instead, towards providing Logical Data Access to the physical structure of a relational database. Therefore, neither *Sarkar*, nor

Kingberg, nor the combination thereof teach or suggest the claimed limitations of independent claims 1, 11 and 15, and therefore do not teach or suggest the claimed limitations of dependent claims 3-4, 9, 12-13 and 16-17. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3-4, 9, 12-13 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Conclusion


Applicants respectfully submit the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Van Nguy at (408) 720-8300, x228.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a)(3), Applicants hereby request and authorize the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 1/31/05



Van N. Nguy
Registration No. 55,851

Customer No. 008791
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(408) 720-8300